

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/766,081	01/29/2004	Reggald E. Isley	R044 0098 GNM/cc	2415	
720	7590 12/12/20	95	EXAMINER		
,	GGS, GREEN & M	MILLER, BENA B			
480 - THE S	STATION CORDOVA STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	ER, BC V6B 1G1	3725			
CANADA		DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					SY
		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/766	5,081	ISLEY, REGGAL	D E.
Offic	ce Action Summary	Examir	ner	Art Unit	T
		Bena M	1iller	3725	
	ILING DATE of this commu	ınication appears on	the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress
Period for Reply			- TO EVOIDE -	MONTH WOOD THEFTY	20) DAVO
WHICHEVER - Extensions of tim after SIX (6) MON - If NO period for re - Failure to reply w Any reply receive	IS LONGER, FROM THE e may be available under the provisio ITHS from the mailing date of this cor	MAILING DATE OF ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no mmunication. statutory period will apply and ply will, by statute, cause the safter the mailing date of this	THIS COMMUN event, however, may d will expire SIX (6) M application to become	a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status					
1) Respons	sive to communication(s) f	iled on .			
· <u> </u>	ion is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is	s non-final.		
· -		*		atters, prosecution as to th	e merits is
,	n accordance with the prac		•	,	
Disposition of Cl	aims				
4) Claim(s)	1-30 is/are pending in the	application.			
	e above claim(s) is		consideration.		
	3-6 and 10-26 is/are allov				
6) Claim(s)	1,2,7-9,19 and 27-30 is/a	re rejected.			
	is/are objected to.	•			
	are subject to rest	riction and/or election	n requirement.		
Application Pape	rs				
9) The spec	cification is objected to by t	the Examiner.			
-	ving(s) filed on is/ar		b) ☐ objected t	o by the Examiner.	
	may not request that any obj				
• •				ng(s) is objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).
	•	-		ed Office Action or form P	` '
Priority under 35	U.S.C. 6 119				
	edgment is made of a clair	n for foreian priority :	under 35 U.S.C	. & 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
=) Some * c) None of:	,, ron ronoligin pinoring s		. 3 (4) (4) 5. (.).	
·	ertified copies of the priorit	v documents have h	een received		
	ertified copies of the priorit	<u>-</u>		Application No.	
	•	<u> </u>		en received in this National	l Stane
	oplication from the Internat			en received in this Mattorial	Otage
-	ttached detailed Office act	·	7 77	nt received	
000 1110 0	ustanoa omoo aot		•		
			Be	rap. Moe.	~
Attachment(s)			, -		
1) Notice of Refere				v Summary (PTO-413)	
	person's Patent Drawing Review			o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)
	losure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o l Date <u>1/29/04&6/27/05</u> .	or P10/55/08)	6) Other: _		∵ 10£j

Application/Control Number: 10/766,081

Art Unit: 3725

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figures 2 and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/766,081

Art Unit: 3725

Claims 1-30 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,923.

The claims of the instant application recites most of the elements of the patented claims except for a textured surface, first and second pockets and a low static coefficient of friction which does not exceed 1 and 4x10⁻¹. However, it would have been obvious to delete these features from the feed roll in the patent for the purpose of making the feed roller more economical to produce.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-9, 19 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims recite subject matter that is not supported by the original specification. Regarding claims 7-9, the claims, in its entirety are not supported by the original specification. Regarding claim 19, the subject matter "the leading and trailing abutment surfaces are provided by surfaces of

the drum" is not supported by the original specification. Regarding claims 27-30, the subject matter "as static coefficient of friction which does not exceed 1 and 4x10⁻¹.

Claims 7-9, 19 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 7-9 and 27-30, it is not whether the band of material has a low static coefficient of friction that does not exceed 1 and $4x10^{-1}$. Regarding claim 19, it is not clear whether "the leading and trailing abutment surfaces is provided by surfaces of the drum".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pascoe (US Patent 5,806,130) or Lehmann (US Patent 4,047,274).

The device of Pascoe or Lehmann reads on the limitations of the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-6 and 10-26 are allowed.

Conclusion

Claims 7-9, 19 and 27-30 are not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bena Miller whose telephone number is 571.272.4427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bena Miller Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725

bbm December 06, 2005